REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 14 March 2005. Responsive to the rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 13 – 18 have been amended to clarify the combination of elements that form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Additionally, Claim 12 has been cancelled by this amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 9, 11 – 15 and 17 – 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Park et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,861,822, in view of Flanigan, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,951.

Before discussing the prior art relied upon by the Examiner, it is believed beneficial to first briefly review the structure of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed. The invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to a power off method for a wireless device. The wireless device includes at least one peripheral circuit, a control chip and a power source providing power to the control chip and the peripheral circuit. The method includes the step of pressing a button of the wireless device. The method proceeds with the step of terminating the power to the at least one peripheral circuit of the wireless device and maintaining the power to the control chip responsive to the button being pressed, to thereby bring the wireless device into a power off mode. The method further includes the step of the control chip maintaining an active ID code during

the power off mode for use at a next turn on mode for saving connection time of the wireless device.

From another perspective, the method includes the step of initiating a synchronization process to uniquely identify the wireless peripheral by selecting one of a plurality of ID codes by a control chip for use in communication with a computer. The method includes the step of pressing a key of the wireless peripheral and the step of terminating power supplied to all other parts of the wireless peripheral except the control chip responsive to the key being pressed to define a power off mode. The control chip maintains the selected ID code during the power off mode for subsequent communications with the computer. The method includes the step of subsequent to the power off mode, pressing the key of the wireless peripheral, which step is followed by the step of reinitiating supplying power to the other parts of the wireless peripheral responsive to the subsequent pressing of the key. The control chip continues to use the selected ID code without repeating the synchronization process.

In contradistinction, the Park et al. reference is directed to a wire/wireless keyboard and control method therefore. The keyboard includes a control section 30 that controls the output of data resulting from scanning of the keys of the keyboard. The control section 30 also monitors the output of the wire/wireless detecting section 38 for determining whether the device is in a wired or wireless mode. In a wired mode, the controller controls the output of the scanned data to

and from a computer. However, in the wireless mode, the control section 30 controls the output of ID numbers of an ID number setting section 33 to a radio frequency transmitting section 40. The section 33 sets a unique ID number so that the computer will recognize the radio frequencies as being from the keyboard. The device further includes a power-down/wake up section 36 which outputs a reset signal to the resetting section 34 if a key is input through the scanning section during the power-down of the control section 30. The resetting section 34 resets the control section 30 in accordance with reset signals of the power-down/wake up section 36. In operation, if there is no key input detected, the control section 30 puts itself into a power-down mode. However, the peripheral circuits remain powered, as evidenced by the power-down/wake up section 36 continuing to check for whether key data has been input and the key scanning section 35 maintaining the capability of detecting a key input, column 7, lines 6 – 9. If and when a key input is detected, the resetting section 34 outputs a reset control signal to the control section 30 to reinitiate its operation. The control section 30 then utilizes the ID number that it obtains from section 33 for further transmissions. Thus, the control section 30 does not maintain the "active" ID number, but obtains it from the ID setting section for use, column 7, lines 14 – 16, and column 8, lines 4 – 5.

Thus, the Park et al. reference teaches away from the method of the invention of the subject Patent Application. Rather than removing power from

peripheral circuits and maintaining power to the control chip, the reference utilizes a scheme which is diametrically opposite to that of the invention of the subject Patent Application, maintaining power to all of the peripheral circuits and placing the control chip in a power-down mode. Further, rather than maintaining an active ID code in the control chip, the reference utilizes an ID number setting section 33 to provide the ID number to the control section for use with each transmission.

The Flanigan reference does not overcome the deficiencies of Park et al. The Flanigan reference is directed to a method of powering down a computer system by performing an unconditional shutdown after interrupts of first and second software systems respectively fail following a power button event. The reference discloses the shutdown of a computer system when the power button is held for a period of four seconds. However, the reference fails to disclose or suggest terminating power to peripheral circuits while maintaining power to the control chip, as claimed. Further, the reference fails to disclose or suggest the control chip maintaining an active ID code during the power off mode for use during the next turn on mode of the device.

Therefore, the combination of Park et al. and Flanigan cannot make obvious the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4, 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Park et al. in view of Flanigan and further in view of Furukawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,766,392.

It is respectfully submitted that the Furukawa et al. reference is directed to an electronic apparatus and a control circuit therefore. The reference discloses simple hardware circuitry, which provides a predefined period of on (low state) time upon the switch being depressed. This predefined period is fixed by the time constant of a resister and a capacitor, and will not be affected by the actual depressing time of the switch. This controlling method is one hardware solution, providing a way to prevent affect on an electronic apparatus resulting from switch contact bounce. The emphasis of Furukawa et al. is not really the same scope as that of this application. However, when combined with Park et al. and Flanigan, the combination still does not provide initiating the synchronization process responsive to the key being pressed for a period of time not exceeding the time T, as claimed.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

David I. Klein
Registration No. 33,253

Dated: 7 June 2005

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-465-6678

Customer No.
04586